

### REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain in the present application. Claims 1 and 18 are independent. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to make them more readable and clear. Applicants assert that the amendments to claims 1 and 18 do not include new matter and that support for the amendments can be found, *inter alia*, on page 2 of the specification.

### **Embodiment of the Present Invention**

To aid the Examiner's understanding of the present invention, an embodiment of the present invention will be briefly described.

In an embodiment of the present invention as disclosed, *inter alia*, on page 2 of the specification, a method defines a characteristic composite fingerprint for a subscriber station associated with the operation of a subscriber station in its authorized coverage area. A composite fingerprint refers to a statistical compilation of detected signal characteristics of a receive signal received from the subscriber station. A characteristic composite fingerprint refers to a composite fingerprint associated with the subscriber station transmitting within an authorized coverage area or another known area. An authorized coverage area is a coverage area where communications service is intentionally provided to a particular subscriber station. In contrast, a restricted coverage area is coverage area where communication service to a particular subscriber station is prohibited or limited. An operational area monitor monitors an operational composite fingerprint for the subscriber station. The operational composite fingerprint refers to a composite fingerprint that is determined while a subscriber station is active, regardless of whether the subscriber station is located in the authorized coverage area or the restricted coverage area. The monitor or another

network element compares the operational composite fingerprint to the characteristic composite fingerprint to determine if the subscriber station is operating within the authorized coverage area or the restricted coverage area.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilsenrath et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,304). Applicants respectfully traverse.

With regard to independent claim 1, Applicants assert that Hilsenrath et al. fail to disclose comparing an operational composite fingerprint for a subscriber station to a characteristic composite fingerprint for the subscriber station as recited in claim 1. Instead, Hilsenrath et al. disclose using GPS location data of a calibration mobile with a signal signature of a separate mobile device to determine a location of a mobile device (Col. 4, lines 58-62). Applicants assert this is different from the recitation of claim 1 wherein a subscriber station is used in both an operational composite fingerprint and a characteristic composite fingerprint. Therefore, Hilsenrath et al. can not disclose or suggest comparing an operational composite fingerprint for a subscriber station to a characteristic composite fingerprint for the subscriber station as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by Hilsenrath et al.

Claim 2 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable independent claim 1 and for its own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the art grounds of rejection.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilsenrath.

With regard to independent claim 18, Applicants assert that Hilsenrath et al. fail to disclose comparing an operational composite fingerprint for a subscriber station to a characteristic composite fingerprint for the subscriber station as recited in claim 18. Instead, Hilsenrath et al. disclose using GPS location data of a calibration mobile with a signal signature of a separate mobile device to determine a location of a mobile device (Col. 4, lines 58-62). Applicants assert this is different from the recitation of claim 18 wherein a subscriber station is used in both an operational composite fingerprint and a characteristic composite fingerprint. Therefore, Hilsenrath et al. can not disclose or suggest comparing an operational composite fingerprint for a subscriber station to a characteristic composite fingerprint for the subscriber station as recited in claim 18. Claim 18 is not rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by Hilsenrath et al.

Claims 19-21 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent claim 18 and for their own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the art grounds of rejection.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 3-17 and 22-25 are allowed. Applicants have not put claims 3-17 and 22-25 into independent form because they depend from one of claims 1 and 18 which Applicants believe have been shown to be allowable.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner

reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.



In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 in the Northern Virginia area, for the purpose of a telephonic interview.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$110.00 is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By   
For  Gary D. Yacura  
Reg. No. 35,416  
Reg. No. 48,781  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, VA 20195  
(703) 390-3030

GDY/RFS:ewd